arXiv:1404.4147v3 [math-ph] 29 Sep 2014

Travelling times in scattering by obstacles

Lyle Noakes and Luchezar Stoyanov

Abstract.

The paper deals with some problems related to recovering information about an obstacle in an Euclidean space from certain measurements of lengths of generalized geodesics in the exterior of the obstacle. The main result is that if two obstacles satisfy some generic regularity conditions and have (almost) the same travelling times, then the generalized geodesic flows in their exteriors are conjugate on the non-trapping part of their phase spaces with a time preserving conjugacy. Apart from that a constructive algorithm is described that shows how to recover an obstacle consisting of two convex domains in the plane from traveling times.

Keywords:
inverse scattering, reflecting ray, generalised geodesic, travelling time, trapped geodesic, generalised geodesic flow

Mathematics Subject Classification: 37Dxx, 37Jxx, 53Dxx

1 Introduction

Let K be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ whose boundary ∂K is a C^∞ manifold of dimension $n-1$. Suppose that $\Omega_K = \overline{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus K}$ is connected. Let S_0 be a large sphere[1] in $\mathbb{R}^n$ bounding an open ball that contains K. For any $x, y \in S_0$, an (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_K is a generalised geodesic (in the sense of Melrose and Sjöstrand [MS1], [MS2]) from x to y. The length of the part of γ from x to y is denoted by t_γ.

This article deals with some problems related to recovering information about the obstacle K from certain measurements of lengths of generalised geodesics in the exterior of K. These problems have similarities with various problems on metric rigidity in Riemannian geometry – see [SU], [SUV] and the references there for more information.

More specifically, we consider the problem of obtaining information about K from travelling times of (x,y)-geodesics, especially from the *travelling times spectrum* $\mathcal{T}_K$ of K, defined as follows.

Definition 1 *Let $\mathcal{T}_K \subset S_0 \times S_0 \times [0,\infty)$ be the set all triples (x,y,t_γ) where γ is an (x,y)-geodesic.* ■

For any $x, y \in S_0$, define $\mathcal{T}_K(x,y) := \{t \in [0,\infty) : (x,y,t) \in \mathcal{T}_K\}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_K(x,y) = \mathcal{T}_K(y,x)$ for all $(x,y) \in S_0 \times S_0$.

The convex hull $\widehat{K}$ of K is easily found from $\mathcal{T}_K$ as follows.

Example 1 *Given $x_0 \in S_0$ let ν_{x_0} be the inward-pointing unit normal to S_0 at x_0. Given $r \geq 0$, let H_r the the hyperplane through $x_0 + r\nu_{x_0}$ and orthogonal to ν_{x_0}. Then H_0 has no common points with the interior of $\widehat{K}$. Let $r(x_0) = \sup\{r : H_s \cap K = \emptyset$ for all $s \leq r\}$. Then, as x_0 varies over S_0, the $\partial H_{r(x_0)}$ are precisely the supporting hyperplanes of $\widehat{K}$. But $H_s \cap K = \emptyset \iff \|x-y\| \in \mathcal{T}_K(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in S_0 \cap H_s$, and so the supporting hyperplanes are characterised in terms of $\mathcal{T}_K$.* ■

[1] Our results extend easily to the case where S_0 is the boundary of some other C^∞ strictly convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing K in its interior.

More generally, given $\mathcal{T}_K$ a hyperplane H in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be *vacuous* when, for all intervals $xy \subset H$ with $x, y \in S_0$, $\|x-y\| \in \mathcal{T}_K(x,y)$. (When $H \cap S_0 = \emptyset$, H is said to be *trivially vacuous*.) The supporting hyperplanes of Example 1 are a special kind of vacuous hyperplane. The set V of all vacuous hyperplanes is an open subset of real projective $n-1$-space, and ∂V is the space of hyperplanes H whose intersections with K are nonempty with H tangent to K. So $\mathcal{T}_K$ determines the envelope $Y \subseteq \partial K$ of ∂V.

Even when it is easy to construct K, it is usually difficult to say which set-valued functions have the form $\mathcal{T}_K$.

Example 2 *Let K be connected and strictly convex. Because K is strictly convex, for any $x \in S_0$ the nearest point z_x in K to x is uniquely defined and C^∞ as a function of x. Notice that the C^∞ function $f : S_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $f(x) = 2\|x - z_x\|$ is characterised in terms of $\mathcal{T}_K$ by $f(x) = \min \mathcal{T}_K(x,x)$.*

For v tangent to S_0 at x we have $df_x(v) = 2\langle v, u_x\rangle$, where u_x is the unit vector from z_x to x. This determines u_x and then z_x in terms of f. Because any $z \in \partial K$ has the form z_x for some $x \in S_0$, it follows that ∂K is recovered from the $\mathcal{T}_K(x,x)$. But K can also be found as $\widehat{K}$ from $\mathcal{T}_K$ as in Example 1, namely by testing the condition $\|x-y\| \in \mathcal{T}_K(x,y)$.

Since the $\mathcal{T}_K(x,x)$ and $\mathcal{T}_K(x,y)$ are independently sufficient to reconstruct the obstacle K, there is an implicit constraint on $\mathcal{T}_K$. Indeed this understates the complexity of the conditions that $\mathcal{T}_K$ needs to satisfy: for this especially simple case it can easily be seen that there are uncountably many different algorithms for reconstructing K from the $\mathcal{T}_K(x,y)$. ■

When the set-valued function $\mathcal{T}_K$ is known only approximately, different algorithms for recovering K (such as in Example 2) usually give different estimates of K. Better estimates could be made if we understood the internal structure of $\mathcal{T}_K$.

If K and L are two obstacles contained in the interior of S_0, we will say that K and L *have almost the same travelling times* if $\mathcal{T}_K(x,y) = \mathcal{T}_L(x,y)$ for almost all $(x,y) \in S_0 \times S_0$ (with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $S_0 \times S_0$). Our main result shows that if K and L satisfy some mild non-degeneracy conditions and have almost the same travelling times, then the generalised geodesic flows in their exteriors are conjugate on the non-trapping part of their phase spaces, with a time preserving conjugacy.

A different inverse scattering problem was studied in [St3] and [St2]. The observables used there to get geometric information about an obstacle K were the so called sojourn times of (ω,θ)-rays γ for pairs (ω,θ) of unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By an (ω,θ)-ray in the exterior Ω_K of K we mean a billiard trajectory in Ω_K incoming from infinity with direction ω and outgoing to infinity with direction θ. If Π_ω is the hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ tangent to S_0 and orthogonal to ω, denote by H_ω the open half-space determined by Π_ω and having ω as an inner normal. For an (ω,θ)-ray γ in Ω_K, the *sojourn time* T_γ is $T'_\gamma - 2a$, where T'_γ is the length of the part of γ contained in $H_\omega \cap H_{-\theta}$ and a is the radius of the sphere S_0.

Denoting by $\mathcal{SL}_K(\omega,\theta)$ the set of sojourn times T_γ of all (ω,θ)-rays γ in Ω_K, the family $\mathcal{SL}_K = \{\mathcal{SL}_K(\omega,\theta)\}_{(\omega,\theta)}$, where (ω,θ) runs over $\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, is called the *scattering length spectrum* of K. It was proved in [St3] that if two obstacles K, L in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with sufficiently 'regular boundaries', have almost the same scattering length spectrum, then

their generalized geodesic flows are conjugate on the non-trapping parts of their phase spaces. This result was then used to derive some properties of obstacles that can be recovered from the scattering length spectrum $\mathcal{SL}_K$ – see Corollary 1 below for some details.

In general the scattering length spectrum does not determine K – see the example of M. Livshits in Ch. 5 of [M]. The same applies to the travelling times spectrum $\mathcal{T}_K$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)} : \dot{T}_b^*(\Omega_K) = T_b^*(\Omega_K) \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow \dot{T}_b^*(\Omega_K)$ be the *generalized geodesic flow* generated by the principal symbol of the wave operator in $\mathbb{R} \times \Omega_K$ (see [MS1], [MS2], or §24.3 in [H]), where $T_b^*(\Omega_K) = T^*(\Omega_K)/\sim$ is the quotient space with respect to the equivalence relation: $(x,\xi) \sim (y,\eta)$ iff $x = y$ and either $\xi = \eta$ or ξ and η are symmetric with respect to the tangent plane to ∂K at x. Denote by $S_b^*(\Omega_K)$ the image of the *unit cosphere bundle* $S^*(\Omega_K)$. In what follows we identify $T^*(\Omega_K)$ and $S^*(\Omega_K)$ with their images in $T_b^*(\Omega_K)$. For any $(y,\eta) \in T^*(\Omega_K)$ set $\mathrm{pr}_1(y,\eta) = y$ and $\mathrm{pr}_2(y,\eta) = \eta$.

Here we make the following assumption about K: for each $(x,\xi) \in T^*(\partial K)$ if the curvature of ∂K at x vanishes of infinite order in direction ξ, then all points (y,η) sufficiently close to (x,ξ) are diffractive points (roughly speaking, this means that ∂K is convex at y in the direction of η). Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the *class of obstacles with this property.* For $K \in \mathcal{K}$ the flow $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$ is well-defined and continuous ([MS2]).

A point $\sigma = (x,\omega) \in S_b^*(\Omega_K)$ is called *non-trapped* if both $\{\mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma)) : t \le 0\}$ and $\{\mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma)) : t \ge 0\}$ in Ω_K are unbounded curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$ be the *set of all trapped points.* In general $\mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$ may have positive Lebesgue measure and non-empty interior in $S_b^*(\Omega_K)$ (see e.g. Livshits' example mentioned above). K is called a *non-trapping* obstacle if $\mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K) = \emptyset$.

Set $S_+^*(S_0) = \{(x,u) : x \in S_0, u \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}\ ,\ \langle x,u\rangle < 0\}$, and let $S_K^*(S_0)$ be *the set of all points of* $S_+^*(S_0)$ *which define non-trapped geodesics* in Ω_K. Consider the cross-sectional map $\mathcal{P}_K : S_K^*(S_0) \longrightarrow S^*(S_0)$ defined by the shift along the flow $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$. Given $\sigma = (x,\xi) \in S_b^*(\Omega_K)$, set $\gamma_K(\sigma) = \{\mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma)) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. A trajectory of this kind is called a *simply reflecting ray* if it has no tangencies to ∂K.

Let γ be a (x_0,y_0)-geodesic in Ω_K for some $x_0, y_0 \in S_0$, which is a simply reflecting ray. Let $\omega_0 \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ be the (incoming) direction of γ at x_0. We will say that γ is *regular* if the differential of map $\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \ni \omega \mapsto \mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{P}_K(x_0,\omega)) \in S_0$ is a submersion at $\omega = \omega_0$, i.e. its differential at that point has rank $n-1$.

Denote by $\mathcal{L}_0$ the class of all obstacles $K \in \mathcal{K}$ such that ∂K does not contain non-trivial open flat subsets and $\gamma_K(x,u)$ is a regular simply reflecting ray for almost all $(x,u) \in S_+^*(S_0)$ such that $\gamma(x,u) \cap \partial K \neq \emptyset$. One can derive from Ch. 3 in [PS1] that $\mathcal{L}_0$ is of second Baire category in $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to the C^∞ Whitney topology in $\mathcal{K}$. That is, generic obstacles $K \in \mathcal{K}$ belong to the class $\mathcal{L}_0$.

The main result in the present paper is the following.

Theorem 1 *If the obstacles $K, L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ have almost the same travelling times, then there exists a homeomorphism $\Phi : \dot{T}_b^*(\Omega_K) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K) \longrightarrow \dot{T}_b^*(\Omega_L) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_L)$ which defines a symplectic map on an open dense subset of $\dot{T}_b^*(\Omega_K) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$, maps $S_b^*(\Omega_K) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$ onto $S_b^*(\Omega_L) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_L)$, and is such that $\mathcal{F}_t^{(L)} \circ \Phi = \Phi \circ \mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi = id$*

on $\dot{T}_b^*(\overset{\circ}{\Omega}_{\hat{K}}) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K) = \dot{T}_b^*(\overset{\circ}{\Omega}_{\hat{L}}) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_L)$. *Conversely, if* $K, L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ *are two obstacles for which there exists a homeomorphism* $\Phi : S_b^*(\Omega_K) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K) \longrightarrow S_b^*(\Omega_L) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_L)$ *such that* $\mathcal{F}_t^{(L)} \circ \Phi = \Phi \circ \mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$ *for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\Phi = id$ *on* $S^*(\overset{\circ}{\Omega}_{\hat{K}}) \setminus \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$, *then* K *and* L *have the same travelling times.*

This result is similar to Theorem 1.1 in [St3], and as a consequence of it we obtain analogues of all results in [St3] and [St2]. For example the existence of the conjugacy Φ implies:

Corollary 1 *Let the obstacles* $K, L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ *have almost the same travelling times. Then:*

(a) *If the sets of trapped points of both* K *and* L *have Lebesgue measure zero, then* $Vol(K) = Vol(L)$.

(b) *If* K *is star-shaped, then* $L = K$.

(c) *Let* $\mathrm{Trap}^{(n)}(\partial K)$ *be the set of those* $x \in \partial K$ *such that* $(x, \nu_K(x)) \in \mathrm{Trap}(\Omega_K)$, *where* $\nu_K(x)$ *is the outward unit normal to* ∂K *at* x. *There exists a homeomorphism* $\varphi : \partial K \setminus \mathrm{Trap}^{(n)}(\partial K) \longrightarrow \partial L \setminus \mathrm{Trap}^{(n)}(\partial L)$ *such that* $\varphi(x) = y$ *whenever* $\Phi(x, \nu_K(x)) = (y, \nu_L(y))$.

(d) *Let* $n \geq 3$, $\dim(\mathrm{Trap}^{(n)}(\partial K)) < n-2$ *and* $\dim(\mathrm{Trap}^{(n)}(\partial L)) < n-2$. *Then* K *and* L *have the same number of connected components.*

(e) *Assume that* ∂K *and* ∂L *are both real analytic and* K *is a finite union of strictly convex domains in* $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Then* $K = L$.

Very recently it was proved in [NS] that the conclusion in (e) remains true without assuming real analyticity of ∂K and ∂L, namely if K and L are both disjoint unions of strictly convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with C^3 boundaries and K and L have almost the same travelling times (or SLS), then $K = L$. This shows that, in principle, K is determined by $\mathcal{T}_K$, and prompts the question of how to actually reconstruct K, assuming K is a disjoint unions of m strictly convex domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundaries. Except when $m = 1$ (Example 2), this is not so simple to answer. The case $m = 2$, $n = 2$ is dealt with in §3, 4. Different methods are needed for $m \geq 3$.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the open ball with boundary $\partial\mathcal{O} = S_0$. Set $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathcal{O}$. As in [St3], the main step in proving Theorem 1 is to show that the flows $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_t^{(L)}$ coincide in Ω.

Theorem 2 *Let* $K, L \in \mathcal{L}_0$, *If* K *and* L *have almost the same travelling times, then the flows* $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}$ *and* $\mathcal{F}_t^{(L)}$ *coincide on* $S^*(\Omega)$. *Namely, for every* $\sigma \in S^*(\Omega)$ *and every* $t \in \mathbb{R}$ *with* $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma) \in S^*(\Omega)$ *we have* $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma) = \mathcal{F}_t^{(L)}(\sigma)$.

The converse statement is also true: if $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma) = \mathcal{F}_t^{(L)}(\sigma)$ holds for all $\sigma \in S^*(\Omega)$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathcal{F}_t^{(K)}(\sigma) \in S^*(\Omega)$, then K and L have (almost) the same travelling times.

We prove Theorem 1 using some ideas from §2 of [St3]. Some technical lemmas will be necessary. The first part of the following lemma is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2 in [PS2]. The second part follows from Sard's Theorem.

Lemma 1 *There exists a subset $\mathcal{S}$ of $S_+^*(S_0)$ the complement of which is a countable union of compact subsets of Lebesgue measure zero in $S_+^*(S_0)$ such that for every $(x,u) \in \mathcal{S}$ the generalised geodesic $\gamma_K(x,u)$ in $S^*(\Omega_K)$ issued from x in direction u has no tangencies to ∂K and moreover $\gamma_K(x,u)$ is regular.* ■

The next lemma is similar to Proposition 4.1 in [PS2]. For completeness we sketch its proof in the Appendix.

Lemma 2 *Let $x_0 \in S_0$ be a fixed point. There exists a subset $\mathcal{S}(x_0)$ of $S^*(S_0)$ the complement of which is a countable union of compact subsets of Lebesgue measure zero in S_0 such that for every $y \in \mathcal{S}(x_0)$ any two different (x_0,y)-geodesics in Ω_K that are simply reflecting and regular, have distinct travelling times.*

The final lemma we need is similar to Lemma 2.2 in [St3].

Lemma 3 *Let $(x_0,y_0) \in S_0 \times S_0$, let γ be a regular simply reflecting (x_0,y_0)-geodesic in Ω_K with successive reflection points $x_1,\dots,x_k$ ($k \geq 1$), let $\omega_0 \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ be the incoming direction of γ at x_0 and let $\mathcal{F}_{t_0}^{(K)}(x_0,\omega_0) = (y_0,\theta_0)$ for some $t_0 > 0$. Then there exist a neighbourhood W of (x_0,y_0) in $S_0 \times S_0$ and for each $i = 1,\dots,k$ a neighbourhood U_i of x_i in ∂K such that for any $(x,y) \in W$ there are unique $x_i(x,y) \in U_i$ ($i = 1,\dots,k$) which are the successive reflection points of a simply reflecting (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_K. Moreover, $x_i(x,y)$ depends smoothly on $(x,y) \in W$ for each $i = 1,\dots,k$, and taking the neighbourhood W sufficiently small, there exists an open neighbourhood V of (x_0,ω_0) in $S_+^*(S_0)$ such that the map $F(x,\omega) = (x, \mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{P}_K(x,\omega)))$ defines a diffeomorphism $F : V \longrightarrow W$.*

Proof: Let γ be as above. Choosing a sufficiently small open neighbourhood V of $\sigma_0 = (x_0,\omega_0)$ in $S_+^*(S_0)$, the cross-sectional map $\mathcal{P}_K : V \longrightarrow S^*(S_0)$ is well-defined and smooth, and for every $\sigma \in V$ the ray $\gamma_K(\sigma)$ is simply reflecting and has exactly k reflection points $x_1(\sigma),\dots,x_k(\sigma)$, depending smoothly on $\sigma \in V$. Then $Y(x,\omega) = \mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{P}_K(x,\omega)) \in S_0$ defines a smooth map on V. Given ω close to ω_0, let $Y_\omega = Y(.,\omega)$. Then $\det dY_\omega(x)$ depends smoothly on $(x,\omega) \in V$, and, since γ is regular, we have $\det dY_{\omega_0}(x_0) \neq 0$. Assuming V small enough, we have $\det dY_\omega(x) \neq 0$ for all $(x,\omega) \in V$. Setting $F(x,\omega) = (x, \mathrm{pr}_1(\mathcal{P}_K(x,\omega))) = (x, Y(x,\omega))$, we get a smooth map $F : V \longrightarrow S_0 \times S_0$ whose differential at $(x,\omega) \in V$ has the form

$$dF(x,\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ * & dY_\omega(x) \end{pmatrix},$$

where I is the identity $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ matrix. Thus, $\det dF(x,\omega)\neq 0$. By the inverse mapping theorem, F is locally invertible. Shrinking V if necessary, F is a diffeomorphism between V and an open neighbourhood W of (x_0,y_0) in $S_0\times S_0$. Setting $G=F^{-1}$, we have $G(x,y)=(x,\omega(x,y))$ for $(x,y)\in W$, where $\omega(x,y)$ is so that $Y(x,\omega(x,y))=y$. Then $x_j(x,y)=x_j(x,\omega(x,y))$ depends smoothly on $(x,y)\in W$ for all $j=1,\ldots,k$, and clearly $x_1(x,y),\ldots,x_k(x,y)$ are the successive reflection points of a simply reflecting (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_K. Finally, if $y_1,\ldots,y_k$ are the successive reflection points of a (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_K for some $(x,y)\in W$ and $y_j\in\partial K$ is sufficiently close to $x_j(x_0,y_0)$ for all j, then we must have $y_j=x_j(x,y)$ for all $j=1,\ldots,k$. ■

Given two obstacles K and L in $\mathbb{R}^n$, fix for a moment a pair of points $(x_0,y_0)\in S_0\times S_0$. Let δ be a non-degenerate simply reflecting (x_0,y_0)-geodesic in Ω_K with reflection points $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ $(k\geq 1)$ and let δ' be a non-degenerate simply reflecting (x_0,y_0)-geodesic in Ω_L with reflection points $y_1,\ldots,y_m$ $(m\geq 1)$. By Lemma 3, there exists a neighbourhood W of (x_0,y_0) in $S_0\times S_0$ such that for each $(x,y)\in W$ there are a unique reflecting (x,y)-geodesic $\delta(x,y)$ in Ω_K with reflection points $x_1(x,y),\ldots,x_k(x,y)$ close to $x_1,\ldots,x_k$, and a unique reflecting (x,y)-geodesic $\delta'(x,y)$ in Ω_L with reflection points $y_1(x,y),\ldots,y_m(x,y)$ close to $y_1,\ldots,y_m$.

An important step in the proof of Theorem 2 is the following.

Lemma 4 *Under the above assumptions, suppose in addition that $t_{\delta(x,y)}=t_{\delta'(x,y)}$ for all $(x,y)\in W$. Then for each $(x,y)\in W$ there exist $\omega(x,y),\theta(x,y)\in\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ such that*

$$\omega(x,y)=\frac{x_1(x,y)-x}{\|x_1(x,y)-x\|}=\frac{y_1(x,y)-x}{\|y_1(x,y)-x\|} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\theta(x,y)=\frac{y-x_k(x,y)}{\|y-x_k(x,y)\|}=\frac{y-y_k(x,y)}{\|y-y_k(x,y)\|}. \tag{2.2}$$

In other words the (x,y)-geodesics $\delta(x,y)$ and $\delta'(x,y)$ income through x with the same direction $\omega(x,y)$ and outgo through y with the same direction $\theta(x,y)$.

Proof: Let $(x(u),y(v))$ be a smooth parametrisation of W near (x_0,y_0) with $u\in U$, $v\in V$ for some open subsets U and V of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Set $x_i(u,v)=x_i(x(u),y(v))$ for $i=1,\ldots,k$ and $y_j(u,v)=y_j(x(u),y(v))$ for $j=1,\ldots,m$, $x_0(u,v)=y_0(u,v)=x(v)$, $x_{k+1}(u,v)=y_{m+1}(u,v)=y(v)$. We will also need the unit vectors

$$e_i(u,v)=\frac{x_{i+1}(u,v)-x_i(u,v)}{\|x_{i+1}(u,v)-x_i(u,v)\|}\quad,\quad \tilde{e}_j(u,v)=\frac{y_{j+1}(u,v)-y_j(u,v)}{\|y_{j+1}(u,v)-y_j(u,v)\|}$$

for all $i=0,1,\ldots,k$ and $j=0,1,\ldots,m$.

Consider the smooth functions

$$f(u,v)=\sum_{i=0}^{k}\|x_i(u,v)-x_{i+1}(u,v)\|\quad,\quad g(u,v)=\sum_{j=0}^{m}\|y_j(u,v)-y_{j+1}(u,v)\|.$$

Since $f(u,v) = g(u,v)$ for all $(u,v) \in U \times V$, the derivatives of these two functions coincide. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial f}{\partial u_j}(u,v) &= \sum_{i=0}^{k} \left\langle \frac{x_i - x_{i+1}}{\|x_i - x_{i+1}\|}, \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial u_j} - \frac{\partial x_{i+1}}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle = -\sum_{i=0}^{k} \left\langle e_i, \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial u_j} - \frac{\partial x_{i+1}}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle \\ &= -\left\langle e_0, \frac{\partial x_0}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle - \left\langle e_1 - e_0, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle - \dots \\ &\quad -\left\langle e_k - e_{k-1}, \frac{\partial x_k}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle + \left\langle e_k, \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle = -\left\langle e_0(u,v), \frac{\partial x}{\partial u_j}(u) \right\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where we took into account that $e_j - e_{j-1}$ is a normal vector to ∂K at $x_j(u,v)$, while $\frac{\partial x_j}{\partial u_j}(u,v)$ is tangent to ∂K at the same point, and also that $x_{k+1}(u,v) = y(v)$ does not depend on u.

Similarly, using the fact that $y_0(u,v) = x_0(u,v)$, one gets

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial u_j}(u,v) = -\left\langle \tilde{e}_0(u,v), \frac{\partial x}{\partial u_j}(u) \right\rangle.$$

Hence

$$\left\langle \tilde{e}_0(u,v) - e_0(u,v), \frac{\partial x}{\partial u_j}(u) \right\rangle = 0$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Since the vectors $\frac{\partial x}{\partial u_j}(u)$ $(j = 1, \dots, n-1)$ form a basis in the tangent space to S_0 at $x(u)$, this shows that $\tilde{e}_0(u,v) - e_0(u,v)$ is parallel to the inward unit normal vector $\nu(x_0(u,v))$ to S_0 at $x_0(u,v)$. Since $e_0(u,v)$ and $\tilde{e}_0(u,v)$ are unit vectors, it now follows that[2] $e_0(u,v) = \tilde{e}(u,v)$ for all $(u,v) \in U \times V$.

In a similar way, differentiating with respect v_j, we get $e_k(u,v) = \tilde{e}_k(u,v)$ for all $(u,v) \in U \times V$. ■

The proof of the lemma shows that from the derivatives of the travelling time function $f(u,v)$, under the non-degeneracy assumption of the lemma, we can recover the incoming and outgoing directions $\omega(u,v)$ and $\theta(u,v)$ of the $(x(u), y(v))$-geodesics in Ω_K. Some other constructive ideas are discussed in §3 below.

Proof of Theorem 2: We follow the main steps in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [St3] with necessary modifications.

Assume that two obstacles $K, L \in \mathcal{L}_0$ have almost the same travelling times. Thus, there exists a subset $\mathcal{R}$ of full Lebesgue measure in $S_0 \times S_0$ such that

$$\mathcal{T}_K(x,y) = \mathcal{T}_L(x,y) \quad , \quad (x,y) \in \mathcal{R}. \tag{2.3}$$

[2]Indeed, fix for a moment u and v. Considering an appropriate coordinate system in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we may assume that $\nu(x_0(u,v)) = -e_n = (0, \dots, 0, -1)$. Let $e_0(u,v) = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$ and $\tilde{e}_0(u,v) = (y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, y_n)$, where obviously we must have $x_n < 0$ and $y_n < 0$. Then $e_0(u,v) - \tilde{e}_0(u,v) = \lambda e_n$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, so $x_i = y_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Now $\|e_0(u,v)\| = \|\tilde{e}_0(u,v)\| = 1$ and $x_n y_n > 0$ imply $e_0(u,v) = \tilde{e}_0(u,v)$.

As in Example 1, it follows that for $(x,y) \in \mathcal{R}$, if a (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_K has a common point with ∂K, then any (x,y)-geodesic in Ω_L has a common point with ∂L (and vice versa). Using Lemma 2 above, we may assume $\mathcal{R}$ is chosen so that: (i) for $(x,y) \in \mathcal{R}$ all (x,y)-geodesics in Ω_K and Ω_L having at least one common point with ∂K and ∂L, respectively, are regular and simply reflecting; (ii) for all $(x,y) \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $t_\gamma \neq t_\delta$ whenever γ and δ are regular simply reflecting (x,y)-geodesics in $\Omega_K \cap \mathcal{O}$ (or $\Omega_L \cap \mathcal{O}$) each of them having at least one reflection point.

To prove the theorem it is enough to show that for every $\sigma \in S^*_+(S_0)$ and every $t > 0$ with $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_t(\sigma) \in S^*(S_0)$ we have $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_t(\sigma) = \mathcal{F}^{(L)}_t(\sigma)$.

Let $\tilde{\sigma}_0 = (\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{\omega}_0) \in S^*_+(S_0)$ and $t_0 > 0$ be such that $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0) \in S^*(S_0)$. We are going to show that $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0) = \mathcal{F}^{(L)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0)$. It follows from Proposition 2.3 of [St2] that $S^*_+(S_0) \setminus S^*_L(S_0)$ has Lebesgue measure zero in $S^*_+(S_0)$. Since the flows $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_0}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(L)}_{t_0}$ are both continuous, it is enough to consider the case $\tilde{\sigma}_0 \in S^*_K(S_0)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_0 \in S^*_L(S_0)$. Similarly, using Lemma 2, we may assume that $\gamma_K(\tilde{\sigma}_0)$ and $\gamma_L(\tilde{\sigma}_0)$ are simply reflecting regular rays each of them having at least one reflection point.

Let $\mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0) = (\tilde{y}_0, \tilde{\theta}_0)$; then $\tilde{y}_0 \in S_0$ and $\gamma_K(\tilde{\sigma}_0)$ is a $(\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{y}_0)$-geodesic. Using the diffeomorphism F from Lemma 4 and the fact that $\mathcal{R}$ is dense in $S_0 \times S_0$ we can find $\sigma_0 = (x_0, \omega_0) \in S^*_+(S_0)$ arbitrarily close to $\tilde{\sigma}_0$ such that for $\mathcal{P}_K(x_0, \omega_0) = (y_0, \theta_0)$ we have $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{R}$.

Let $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k$ be the successive reflection points of $\delta = \gamma_K(x_0, \omega_0)$, where $k \geq 1$. By (2.3), there exists a (simply reflecting, regular) (x_0, y_0)-geodesic δ' in Ω_L with

$$t_{\delta'} = t_\delta. \tag{2.4}$$

If $y_1, \ldots, y_m$ are the successive reflection points of δ', we must have $m \geq 1$ (see e.g. Example 1). Using Lemma 3, there exist a neighbourhood W of (x_0, y_0) in $\mathbf{S}^{n-1} \times \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ and a neighbourhood U_i of x_i in ∂K for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$ such that for every $(x,y) \in W$ there is a unique reflecting (x,y)-geodesic $\delta(x,y)$ in Ω_K with reflection points $x_i(x,y) \in U_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, k)$ smoothly depending on (x,y). By the same argument, there exists a neighbourhood U'_j of y_j in ∂L for each $j = 1, \ldots, m$ such that for every $(x,y) \in W$ there is a unique reflecting (x,y)-geodesic $\delta'(x,y)$ in Ω_L with reflection points $y_i(x,y) \in U'_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$ smoothly depending on (x,y). Clearly $\delta(x_0, y_0) = \delta$ and $\delta'(x_0, y_0) = \delta'$.

Next, using (2.3) again, for $(x,y) \in \mathcal{R} \cap W$ there exists a unique reflecting (x,y)-geodesic $\delta''(x,y)$ in Ω_L with

$$t_{\delta''(x,y)} = t_{\delta(x,y)}. \tag{2.5}$$

We claim that if W is chosen small enough, then $\delta''(x,y) = \delta'(x,y)$ for all $(x,y) \in \mathcal{R} \cap W$. Assume this is not true. Then there exists a sequence $\{(x_p, y_p)\}_{p=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{R} \cap W$ with $(x_p, y_p) \to (x_0, y_0)$ as $p \to \infty$ and $\delta''(x_p, y_p) \neq \delta'(x_p, y_p)$ for all p. Denote by ω_p the (incoming) direction of $\delta''(x_p, y_p)$ at x_p; then $\delta''(x_p, y_p) = \gamma_L(x_p, \omega_p)$. Taking a subsequence, we may assume $\omega_p \to \omega \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ as $p \to \infty$. Then $\delta'' = \gamma_L(x_0, \omega)$ is a (x_0, y_0)-geodesic in Ω_L and clearly $t_{\delta''} = \lim_p t_{\delta''(x_p, y_p)} = t_{\delta''(x_0, y_0)}$. By (2.5), $t_{\delta''} = t_{\delta(x_0, y_0)} = t_\delta$, and by (2.4), $t_{\delta''} = t_{\delta'}$. Now $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ implies $\delta'' = \delta'$. Thus, x lies on $\delta' = \delta'(x_0, y_0)$, so for large p, the ray $\delta''(x_p, y_p)$ has m reflection points the jth of which is in U'_j. Now the choice of W and the uniqueness of the (x,y)-geodesics $\delta'(x,y)$ for $(x,y) \in W$ imply

$\delta''(x_p, y_p) = \delta'(x_p, y_p)$. This is impossible by the choice of the sequence $\{(x_p, y_p)\}_p$ which proves that $\delta''(x, y) = \delta'(x, y)$ for all $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R} \cap W$. Therefore

$$t_{\delta'(x,y)} = t_{\delta(x,y)} \tag{2.6}$$

for $(\omega, \theta) \in \mathcal{R} \cap W$. Since $\mathcal{R} \cap W$ is dense in W, by continuity it follows that (2.6) holds for all $(x, y) \in W$. Now Lemma 4 shows that $\delta'(x, y)$ and $\delta(x, y)$ have the same incoming direction at x and the same outgoing direction at y. In particular, $\delta' = \gamma_L(\sigma_0)$ and it has outgoing direction θ_0 at y_0. Thus, $\mathcal{F}^{(L)}_{t_{\delta'}}(\sigma_0) = (y_0, \theta_0) = \mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_\delta}(\sigma_0)$. Letting σ_0 tend to $\tilde{\sigma}_0$ (and then $t_\delta = t_{\delta'}$ tends to t_0), we get $\mathcal{F}^{(L)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0) = \mathcal{F}^{(K)}_{t_0}(\tilde{\sigma}_0)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 1: This is now done exactly as the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [St3]. ■

3 Reflexive Geodesics

For $m \geq 1$ let K be the union of m disjoint strictly convex bodies $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_m$ whose boundaries are C^∞ manifolds of dimension $n-1$. Then, as indicated following Corollary 1 and proved in [NS], K is determined uniquely by $\mathcal{T}_K$. The proof in [NS] is nonconstructive, and it is not easy to give a constructive algorithm except in simple cases. The case where $m = 1$ is easily dealt with in Example 2. The present section and the next give a construction sufficient for $m = 2$.

For (x, y) in some subset U of $S_0 \times S_0$ whose complement is a countable union of compact subsets of Lebesgue measure zero, all (x, y)-geodesics are regular and simply reflecting. Given an (x_0, y_0)-geodesic γ_0 where $(x_0, y_0) \in U$, there is a connected open subset U_{γ_0} of $S_0 \times S_0$ containing (x_0, y_0) and a unique C^∞ assignment $(x, y) \in U_{\gamma_0} \mapsto \gamma_{(x,y)}$ with $\gamma_{(x_0,y_0)} = \gamma_0$ such that $\gamma_{(x,y)}$ is a regular simply reflecting (x, y)-geodesic. Take U_{γ_0} to be the largest such subset and define $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}(x, y) := t_{\gamma_{(x,y)}}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0} : U_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^∞ and $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}(x, y) \in \mathcal{T}_K(x, y)$. The following result is proved in the same way as Lemma 4.

Lemma 5 *For a and b tangent to S_0 at x and y respectively where $(x, y) \in U_0$, we have*

$$d\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0(x,y)}(a, b) = \langle v, b \rangle - \langle u, a \rangle$$

where u and v are the unit vectors in the directions of $\dot{\gamma}_{x,y}$ at x and y respectively. ■

In particular u and v are found by differentiating $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}$.

Definition 2 *An (x, y)-geodesic γ is said to be* reflexive *when it intersects some point of ∂K orthogonally. Then $x = y$ and, for some $p \geq 1$, the points of intersection of γ can be written $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{p-1}, z_p, z_{p-1}, \ldots, z_2, z_1$. The integer p is the* order *of the reflexive geodesic γ.* ■

Reflexive geodesics γ correspond precisely to generalised geodesics leaving K orthogonally at z_p, then intersecting K at $z_{p-1}, z_{p-2}, \ldots, z_2, z_1$ before ending on S_0. We call z_p the *middle reflection point* of the reflexive geodesic. When $z \in \partial K$ is z_p for a reflexive geodesic γ, the *order* of z is defined to be the order of γ. Any $z \in \partial K$ that is not the end

of a reflexive geodesic is said to have *infinite order*. The set of points of finite order is the complement in ∂K of a countable union of compact subsets of Lebesgue measure zero.

Examples can be given of non-reflexive (x,x)-geodesics. When $(x,x) \in U_0$, a necessary and sufficient condition for $\gamma_{(x,x)}$ to be reflexive is that $v = -u$. This condition can be tested by differentiating $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}$ as in Lemma 5.

Given a reflexive (x_0,x_0)-geodesic γ_0 where $(x_0,x_0) \in U$, let V_{γ_0} be the largest connected open subset of S_0 with the property that $\gamma_{(x,x)}$ is reflexive for all $x \in V_{\gamma_0}$. Then for $x \in V_{\gamma_0}$ the middle reflection point of $\gamma_{(x,x)}$ has constant order, namely the order p of γ_0. For $x \in V_{\gamma_0}$ define $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}(x) = \mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}(x,x)$. Then $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0} : V_{\gamma_0} \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^∞ and from Lemma 5 (or Lemma 4) we obtain the following result.

Lemma 6 *For $x \in V_{\gamma_0}$, the unit vector in the direction of $x - z_1$ is determined by the derivative of $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}$ at $x \in V_{\gamma_0}$.* ■

In particular when γ_0 has order 1, $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}(x) = 2\|x - z_1\|$. Consequently

Lemma 7 *The set Z of points of order 1 is determined by the real-valued functions $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}$ defined by first order reflexive (x_0,x_0)-geodesics γ_0 where $(x_0,x_0) \in U$.* ■

It remains to construct the $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}$ from the set-valued $\mathcal{T}_K$. Here we do so only for the following special case, where γ_0 has order 1 and K has 2 connected components.

Example 3 *Set $m = 2$. Then the infimum τ_1 of $\cup_{x \in S_0} \mathcal{T}_K(x,x)$ lies in $\mathcal{T}_K(x_0,x_0)$ for some (at most two) $x_0 \in S_0$. The inward ray orthogonal to S_0 at x_0 meets ∂K orthogonally at $z_1 = x_0 + \tau_1 \nu_{x_0}/2$, and the interval $x_0 z_1$ does not meet K at any other point. So the track-sum of $x_0 z_1$ and $z_1 x_0$ is an order 1 reflexive geodesic γ_0, which can be found from $\mathcal{T}_K$. Set $y_0 = x_0$ and define U_{γ_0} as before. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}$ determines $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}$, and for all $(x,y) \in U_{\gamma_0}$ there exists an (x,y)-geodesic meeting ∂K only on ∂K_1, where the K_i are labelled so that $z_1 \in \partial K_1$.*

The space V of vacuous hyperplanes is determined from $\mathcal{T}_K$ as in §1, and has two path-components because $m = 2$. Choose a vacuous hyperplane H in the path component of V that does not contain the trivially vacuous hyperplanes. Then K_2 is contained in the interior of the closed half-space $\tilde{H}$ bounded by H for which $z_1 \notin \tilde{H}$.

Because K_2 is strictly convex, the infimum τ_2 of $\cup_{x \in S_0 \cap \tilde{H}} \mathcal{T}_K(x,x)$ lies in $\mathcal{T}_K(x_2,x_2)$ for some $x_2 \in S_0 \cap \tilde{H}$. The inward ray orthogonal to S_0 at x_2 meets ∂K_2 orthogonally at $z_2 = x_2 + \tau_2 \nu_{x_2}/2 \in \partial K_2$, and $x_2 z_2$ does not meet ∂K at any other point. So $x_2 z_2$ and $z_2 x_2$ define an order 1 reflexive geodesic γ_2. Define U_{γ_2} and $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_2} : U_{\gamma_2} \to \mathbb{R}$ by analogy with U_{γ_0} and $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_0}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\gamma_2}$ determines $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_2}$, and for all $(x,y) \in U_{\gamma_2}$ there exists an (x,y)-geodesic meeting ∂K only on ∂K_{γ_2}. ■

In §1 a subset Y of ∂K is constructed using vacuous geodesics found from $\mathcal{T}_K$. Sometimes $Y \cup Z$ is dense in ∂K, but usually not when the K_i are close together. When $m = 2$ we can recover ∂K as follows.

4 Two Strictly Convex Components

Take $m = 2$ and set $\rho_K := \min\{t : (x, x, t) \in \mathcal{T}_K\}$. By strict convexity $X_K := \{x \in S_0 : (x, x, \rho_K) \in \mathcal{T}_K\}$ has at most two points; we consider the generic case where X_K is a singleton $\{x_K\}$. Then $z_K := x_K + (\rho_K/2)\nu_0(x_K) \in \partial K$. We label the components of K so that $z_K \in \partial K_1$.

Definition 3 *Define $\mathcal{Z}_0 = \emptyset$ and, for $k \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{Z}_k$ be the set of all $z \in \partial K$ such that the open outward normal ray from z first meets K only in $\mathcal{Z}_{k-1}$.* ■

In particular $x_K \in \mathcal{Z}_1$. The $\mathcal{Z}_k$ are open and mutually disjoint subsets of ∂K, alternatively characterized as follows.

Denote the unit outward normal field on ∂K by ν, and let γ_z be the generalized geodesic beginning at $z \in \partial K$ with initial direction $\nu(z)$. Let $\pi(z)$ be the first intersection after z of γ_z with $S_0 \cup \partial K$. Then $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \pi^{-1}S_0$ and $\mathcal{Z}_{k+1} = \pi^{-1}\mathcal{Z}_k$ for $k \geq 1$.



Figure 1: $z_1 = \pi(z)$ where $z \in \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,1}$ and $p = 4$

We have $\mathcal{Z}_1 = \mathcal{Z}_1^1 \cup \mathcal{Z}_1^2$ where $\mathcal{Z}_1^i$ is an open arc in ∂K_i for $i = 1, 2$. Let $z_\infty^1 z_\infty^2$ be the shortest line segment joining K_1 and K_2, where $z_\infty^i \in \partial K_i$. After rotating $z_\infty^1 z_\infty^2$ to vertical, the endpoints of the $\mathcal{Z}_1^i$ are labelled as left or right, namely $z_1^{L,i}$ and $z_1^{R,i}$.

For $k \geq 2$, $\mathcal{Z}_k$ has two path components on each side of $z_\infty^1 z_\infty^2$, labelled (left and right) thus:

$$\mathcal{Z}_k = \mathcal{Z}_k^L \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^R \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{Z}_k^L = \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Z}_k^R = \mathcal{Z}_k^{R,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^{R,2}$$

with $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}, \mathcal{Z}_k^{R,i} \subset \partial K_i$ mutually disjoint open arcs. Then $\mathcal{Z}_1^i$ is separated from $\mathcal{Z}_2^{L,i}$ only by $z_1^{L,i}$ and, for $k \geq 2$, $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ is separated from $\mathcal{Z}_{k+1}^{L,i}$ by a single point $z_k^{L,i}$. So $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ is the open arc in ∂K_i from $z_{k-1}^{L,i}$ to $z_k^{L,i}$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} z_k^{L,i} = z_\infty^i$, as illustrated in Figure 2.

For uniformity of notation, write $\mathcal{Z}_1^{L,i} := \mathcal{Z}_1^{R,i} := \mathcal{Z}_1^i$ where $i = 1, 2$.



Figure 2: $z_k^{L,1} z_{k-1}^{L,2}$ orthogonal to ∂K_1 and $z_k^{L,2} z_{k-1}^{L,1}$ orthogonal to ∂K_2

Lemma 8 *For $z \in \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ where $k \geq 2$ and $i = 1, 2$, all reflection points of γ_z lie in $\cup_{j<k}(\mathcal{Z}_j^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_j^{L,2})$.*

Proof: Suppose $z \in \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,1}$, and let $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_p \in \partial K$ be the reflection points, taken in order from z, of γ_z as in Figure 1. Then z_q lies in ∂K_1 or ∂K_2 according as q is even or odd, where $1 \leq q \leq p$ and $1 \leq p \leq k-1$. From the definition of $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,1}$ we have $z_1 \in \mathcal{Z}_{k-1}^{L,2}$. If $k = 2$ this proves the lemma.

If $k > 2$ suppose inductively that, for some $1 \leq q < p$ and all $1 \leq r \leq q$ we have $z_r \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_r}^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_{j_r}^{L,2}$ where $k > j_1 > j_2 > \ldots > j_q > 1$.
If q is even then $z_{q-1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_{q-1}}^{L,2}$, $z_q \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_q}^{L,1}$. From the definition of $\mathcal{Z}_j^{L,i}$, the unit outward normal $\nu(z_q)$ from K_1 at z_q points towards $\mathcal{Z}_{j_q-1}^{L,2}$, namely $\pi(z_q) \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_q-1}^{L,2}$. The line segment $z_{q-1}z_q$ approaches z_q from the right, and so its reflection meets ∂K_1 at least as far to the left as $\pi(z_q)$, namely $z_{q+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_{q+1}}^{L,1}$ where $j_{q+1} < j_q$. If q is odd a similar argument holds with superscripts 1 and 2 interchanged. In either case $z_{q+1} \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_{q+1}}^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_{j_{q+1}}^{L,2}$, which completes the induction. So for all $1 \leq q \leq p$, we have $z_q \in \mathcal{Z}_{j_q}^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_{j_q}^{L,2}$ with $1 \leq j_q < k$, where the sequence $\{j_q : 1 \leq q \leq p\}$ is strictly decreasing. This proves the lemma. ■

The set Z found from Example 3 is $\mathcal{Z}$ whose path-components are $\mathcal{Z}_1^1$ and $\mathcal{Z}_1^2$. To find the rest of K we need $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_k^{R,i}$ for all $k \geq 2$ and $i = 1, 2$. These sets will be found from the *echograph* $\mathcal{E}_K$, defined in terms of $\mathcal{T}_K$ to be

$$\mathcal{E}_K := \{x - t\nu_0(x)/2 : (x, x, t) \in \mathcal{T}_K\} \subset E^2,$$

where $\nu_0 : S_0 \to S^1$ denotes the unit inward normal along S_0. Define $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_K} : \mathcal{E}_K \to S_0$ by taking $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_K}(w)$ to be the point on S_0 nearest $w \in \mathcal{E}_K$, namely $\pi_{\mathcal{E}_K}(x - t\nu_0(x)/2) = x$.

Example 4 *Let K_1, K_2 be the regions bounded by the ellipses given implicitly by*

$$\frac{4(x_1 + \frac{6}{5})^2}{9} + 4(x_2 + \frac{13}{10})^2 = 1, \quad \frac{(x_1 - x_2)^2}{8} + \frac{(x_1 + x_2 - 1)^2}{2} = 1,$$

and choose S_0 to be the circle of radius 4 and centre $c_0 = (0, 0)$. Figure 3 shows a discrete approximation to $\mathcal{E}_K$ obtained by sampling reflexive trajectories whose middle reflection points are distributed uniformly along ∂K. ■



Figure 3: $\mathcal{E}_K$ for Example 4.

The echograph is a union of C^∞ arcs meeting in cusps at endpoints, with all other points of intersection transversal. A continuous locally one-to-one function $\sigma : \partial K - \{z^1_\infty, z^2_\infty\} \to \mathcal{E}_K$ is given by $\sigma(z) := x - t\nu_0(x)$ where $\gamma_z(t) = x \in S_0$. Then σ maps the known subsets $\mathcal{Z}^1_1$ and $\mathcal{Z}^2_1$ of ∂K to the arcs of $\mathcal{E}_K$ nearest S_0 (the innermost red and blue respectively in Figure 3).

Suppose inductively that, for some $k \geq 2$, $\cup_{j<k}(\mathcal{Z}^{L,1}_j \cup \mathcal{Z}^{L,2}_j)$ is determined. Then the corresponding C^∞ arcs $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}^{L,1}_j), \sigma(\mathcal{Z}^{L,2}_j)$ in $\mathcal{E}_K$ are also determined. We might not know $\mathcal{Z}^{L,i}_k$, but its image $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}^{L,i}_k)$ can be seen in the epigraph, since the neighbouring arc $\mathcal{Z}^{L,i}_{k-1}$

is already determined. There is a diffeomorphism $w \mapsto z$ from the known $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i})$ onto the unknown $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ where $x = \pi_{\mathcal{E}_K}(w) \in S_0$ is the intersection of S_0 and $\gamma_z([0,\infty))$.

Given $w \in \sigma(\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i})$ let γ_0 be the reflexive geodesic containing γ_z. The travelling-time function $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0} : V_{\gamma_0} \to \mathbb{R}$ of §3 is determined from $\sigma(\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i})$, and therefore so is the initial direction of γ_0 at x, by Lemma 6. In other words the terminal direction of γ_z at $x \in S_0$ is determined.

Now, by Lemma 8 and the inductive hypothesis, the intersections of γ_z with ∂K occur where ∂K is already determined, except for the undetermined initial point z. Therefore, working backwards from x and the terminal direction, the points $z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_p$ of intersection (except for z) of γ_z with ∂K are determined, and so is the direction from z_1 to z. So z is determined by $\|z - z_1\|$, which is determined by the length of γ_z, namely by $\mathcal{S}_{\gamma_0}(x)$ which is also determined. So all points z in $\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,i}$ are determined, and similarly all of $\mathcal{Z}_k^{R,i}$. This completes the induction. Then ∂K is determined as the closure of

$$\cup_{k\geq 1}(\mathcal{Z}_k^{L,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^{L,2} \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^{R,1} \cup \mathcal{Z}_k^{R,2}).$$

5 Appendix

Proof of Lemma 2: The argument is similar to that in the proof of Proposition 4.1 in [PS2]. For convenience we will assume that S_0 is centred at 0. Fix an arbitrary point $x_0 \in S_0$ and two integers $k, m \geq 1$. Let $\omega_0, \omega_0' \in \mathbf{S}^{n-1}$, and let $\omega(u)$ $(u \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ and $\omega(v)$ $(v \in V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1})$ be smooth parametrizations of small neighbourhoods of $\mathbf{S}^{n-1}$ near ω_0 and ω_0', respectively. Assuming $\omega_0 \neq \omega_0'$, we take U and V sufficiently small so that $\omega(u) \neq \omega(v)$ for all $u \in U$ and $v \in V$.

We will consider pairs of simply reflecting regular (x_0, y)-geodesics $\gamma(u)$ and $\gamma(v)$ in Ω_K issued from x_0 in directions $\omega(u)$ and $\omega(v)$, respectively, such that $\gamma(u)$ has exactly k reflection points $x_1(u), \ldots, x_k(u)$ and $\gamma(v)$ has exactly m reflection points $y_1(v), \ldots, y_m(v)$. Set $x_0(u) = x_0 = y_0(v)$ and $x_{k+1}(u) = y = y_{m+1}(v)$. Then the travelling times of the two geodesics are

$$f(u) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \|x_i(u) - x_{i+1}(u)\| \quad , \quad g(v) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \|y_j(v) - y_{j+1}(v)\|.$$

Given an arbitrary $r = 1, \ldots, n$, let $M(k, m, r)$ be the set of those $(u, v) \in U \times V$ for which there exist $y \in S_0$ with $y^{(r)} \neq 0$ and simply reflecting regular (x_0, y)-geodesics in Ω_K, $\gamma(u)$ with k reflection points issued from x_0 with direction $\omega(u)$ and $\gamma(v)$ with m reflection points issued from x_0 with direction $\omega(v)$ and having equal travelling times.

Lemma 2 is an immediate consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 9 *For all $k, m \geq 1$ and $r = 1, \ldots, n$ the set $M(k, m, r)$ is a smooth submanifold of $U \times V$ of dimension $n - 2$.*

Proof. Let $k, m \geq 1$ and let e.g. $r = n$. For $u \in U$, $v \in V$, let $\gamma(u)$, $\gamma(v)$, $x_i(u)$, $y_j(v)$, $f(u)$, $g(v)$ be as above. Set $h(u,v) = f(u) - g(v)$, $h_p(u,v) = x_{k+1}^{(p)}(u) - y_{m+1}^{(p)}(v)$ for $p = 1, \ldots, n-1$, and consider the map $H : U \times V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by

$$H(u,v) = (h(u,v), h_1(u,v), \ldots, h_{n-1}(u,v)).$$

We will show that H is a submersion on $M(k,m,n) = H^{-1}(0)$.

Let $H(u,v) = 0$ and assume that

$$B \operatorname{grad} h(u,v) + \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} A_p \operatorname{grad} h_p(u,v) = 0 \tag{5.7}$$

for some $B, A_1, \ldots, A_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}$. Set $A_n = 0$ and consider the vector $A = (A_1, \ldots, A_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Notice that $H(u,v) = 0$ implies $x_{k+1}(u) = y_{m+1}(v)$.

Next, as in the proof of Lemma 4, considering the vectors

$$e_i(u) = \frac{x_{i+1}(u) - x_i(u)}{\|x_{i+1}(u) - x_i(u)\|} \quad , \quad \tilde{e}_j(v) = \frac{y_{j+1}(v) - y_j(v)}{\|y_{j+1}(v) - y_j(v)\|},$$

and using $\frac{\partial x_0}{\partial u_j} = 0$, $e_0(u) = \omega(u)$ and $\tilde{e}_0(v) = \omega'(v)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_s}(u) &= -\left\langle e_0, \frac{\partial x_0}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle - \left\langle e_1 - e_0, \frac{\partial x_1}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle - \ldots \\ &\quad - \left\langle e_k - e_{k-1}, \frac{\partial x_k}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle + \left\langle e_k, \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_j} \right\rangle = \left\langle e_k(u), \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_s}(u) \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In the same way,

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial v_s}(u,v) = \left\langle \tilde{e}_{m+1}(v), \frac{\partial x}{\partial v_s}(v) \right\rangle.$$

Now considering in (5.7) the derivatives with respect to u_s for some $s = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we get

$$B \frac{\partial f}{\partial u_s}(u) + \sum_{p=1}^{n} A_p \frac{\partial x_{k+1}^{(p)}}{\partial u_s}(u) = 0,$$

that is

$$B \left\langle e_k(u), \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_s}(u) \right\rangle + \left\langle A, \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_s}(u) \right\rangle = 0,$$

so $Be_k(u) + A \perp \frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_s}(u)$ for all $s = 1, \ldots, n-1$. However, since the geodesic $\gamma(u)$ is regular, the vectors $\frac{\partial x_{k+1}}{\partial u_s}(u)$ $(s = 1, \ldots, n-1)$ form a basis for the tangent space to S_0 at $x_{k+1}(u)$, and therefore the vector $Be_k(u) + A$ must be perpendicular to this tangent space, i.e. it is parallel to $x_{k+1}(u)$ (which is a normal vector to S_0 at $x_{k+1}(u)$). Thus,

$$Be_k(u) + A = \lambda\, x_{k+1}(u) \tag{5.8}$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

Similarly, considering derivatives with respect to v_s in (5.7) we get $B\tilde{e}_m(v) + A = \mu\, y_{m+1}(v)$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $x_{k+1}(u) = y_{m+1}(v)$, we now get

$$B(e_k(u) - \tilde{e}_m(v)) = (\lambda - \mu)x_{k+1}(u). \tag{5.9}$$

Since $\omega(u) \neq \omega(v)$ (this is true for all $u \in U$ and $v \in V$ by the choice of U and V), the geodesics $\gamma(u)$ and $\gamma(v)$ are different, and then $x_{k+1}(u) = y_{m+1}(v)$ implies $e_k(u) \neq \tilde{e}_m(v)$. Thus, there exists a tangent vector w to S_0 at $x_{k+1}(u)$ (i.e. a vector $\perp x_{k+1}(u)$) such that $\langle e_k(u), w\rangle \neq \langle \tilde{e}_m(v), w\rangle$. Using this in (5.9) gives $B = 0$. Now (5.8) reads $A = \lambda\, x_{k+1}(u)$. However, $A_n = 0$, while $x_{k+1}^{(n)}(u) \neq 0$ by assumption, so we must have $\lambda = 0$ and therefore $A = 0$.

This proves that H is a submersion at any $(u, v) \in H^{-1}(0)$, and therefore $M(k, m, n)$ is a submanifold of $U \times V$ of codimension n, i.e. of dimension $n - 2$. ■

References

[H] L. Hörmander, The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators, vol. III, Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[Hi] M. Hirsch, Differential Topology, Springer, Berlin, 1976.

[LP1] P. Lax, R. Phillips, Scattering Theory, Academic Press, Amsterdam, 1967

[LP2] P. Lax, R. Phillips, The scattering of sound waves by an obstacle, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 30 (1977) 195-233.

[Ma] A. Majda, A representation formula for the scattering operator and the inverse problem for arbitrary bodies, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 30 (1977) 165-194.

[MaR] A. Majda, J. Ralston, An analogue of Weyl's formula for unbounded domains, Duke Math. J. 45 (1978) 183-196.

[M] R. Melrose, Geometric Scattering Theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[MS1] R. Melrose, J. Sjöstrand, Singularities in boundary value problems I, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 31 (1978) 593-617.

[MS2] Melrose, J. Sjöstrand, Singularities in boundary value problems II, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 35 (1982) 129-168.

[NS] L. Noakes, L. Stoyanov, Rigidity of scattering lengths and traveling times for disjoint unions of convex bodies, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear (arXiv:1402.6445).

[P] V. Petkov, High frequency asymptotics of the scattering amplitude for non-convex bodies, Commun. Partial Diff. Equations 5 (1980) 293-329.

[PS1] V. Petkov, L. Stoyanov, Geometry of Reflecting Rays and Inverse Spectral Problems, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1992.

[PS2] V. Petkov, L. Stoyanov, Sojourn times of trapping rays and the behaviour of the modified resolvent of the Laplacian, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincare (Physique Theorique) 62 (1995) 17-45.

[Si] Ya. Sinai, Development of Krylov's ideas, An addendum to the book: N.S.Krylov, Works on the foundations of statistical physics, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton (1979) 239-281.

[SU] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, Boundary rigidity and stability for generics simple metrics, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 18 (2005) 975-1003.

[SUV] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, A. Vasy, Boundary rigidity with partial data, Preprint 2013.

[St1] L. Stoyanov, Generalized Hamiltonian flow and Poisson relation for the scattering kernel, Ann. Scient. Éc. Norm. Sup. 33. (2000) 361-382.

[St2] L. Stoyanov, On the scattering length spectrum for real analytic obstacles, J. Funct. Anal. 177 (2000) 459-488.

[St3] L. Stoyanov, Rigidity of the scattering length spectrum, Math. Ann. 324 (2002) 743-771.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Western Australia, Crawley 6009 WA, Australia
E-mails: lyle.noakes@uwa.edu.au, luchezar.stoyanov@uwa.edu.au